



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,087	09/12/2005	Ning-Ping Chan	QNAT0001P	1993
7590	11/01/2010		EXAMINER	
LEON E. JEW, Esq.			YEN, ERIC L	
DAHYEE LAW GROUP				
Suite 288			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5776 Stoneridge Mall Rd.				2626
Pleasanton, CA 94588				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,087	CHAN, NING-PING	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERIC YEN	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 8, 15, 32, 59 and 60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8, 15, 32, 59, 60 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Office Action mailed 6/2/10, applicant has submitted an amendment filed 8/31/10.

Claims 8, 15, 32, 59, 60, have been amended.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/31/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that the previous indication of allowability still applies to the currently recited claims is not correct because the indication of allowability was with regard to the independent claims consisting of the steps described in the limitations filed 10/8/09, "which excludes the other steps necessary to perform those steps listed in the claims" (Amendment, page 12).

Applicant emphasizes the consisting of close-end format and argues that "their scopes were not changed" (Amendment, page 12), however this argument is inaccurate because, as per applicant's quote, the indicated allowable subject matter was "the combination of only those method steps in the claims, which excludes the other steps necessary to perform those steps listen in the claims". The allowable subject matter was directed to a combination excluding essential steps. Applicant's amendments since the indication of allowable subject matter has made the essential steps part of the claim scope, and so the claim scope HAS changed.

Therefore, the previous indication of allowable subject matter does not apply because it was directed to a combination excluding essential steps that the claim scope now includes. It was not an indication provided solely on the basis of using the word "consisting" and was based on precisely what the claims consisted of.

Applicant argues that "the cited reference does not disclose any technical information which sufficiently enables an ordinary person in the art to carry out the invention claimed in the present application" (Amendment, pages 13-14).

Applicant argues that "under the totality of circumstances, because Proszeky does not disclose and thus does not anticipate the specific features of 4.2(a) and 4.2(b), the cited references would not enable one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to make the invention which is claimed in the close-end format ("CONSISTING OF") and therefore would not render the claimed invention obvious" (Amendment, pages 15-16).

Before addressing the claim limitations and references themselves, applicant's general arguments are incorrect because, first, prior art references are not required to provide technical details when such details can be readily designed and implemented by knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The references, in teaching their functions, can suggest and render obvious what can be done technically.

Also, applicant's argument that Proszeky does not anticipate the limitations is also incorrect because anticipation and obviousness are different standards. What a reference anticipates is limited to the four corners of the reference. What is rendered

obvious is not. One of ordinary skill in the art can read a reference can make inferences based on what is suggested by the references even though it may not be explicitly taught.

Finally, applicant's claim language is not given applicant's intended meaning, only the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the Specification without reading the Specification into the claims. Therefore, any particular implementation or any intended meaning for applicant's claim language is not relevant as long as what is taught in the references can be described by each and every word in the claims.

As per applicant's specific arguments directed to Proszeky:

Applicant argues that Proszeky does not disclose "4.2(a) screen-scraping a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's mouse pointer" because "Proskezky suggests that 'the user only has to move the mouse pointer over the appropriate word' but it does not [suggest/teach] isolating a segment of text for performing the recognition of text" (Amendment, page 14).

Whether Proszeky does or does not teach the details about how it processes a given word, Proszeky nevertheless teaches moving the mouse pointer over an appropriate word and displaying its translation. Unless there is some determination by the system that a given word is to be translated, the system cannot know which word to translate. Therefore, it is at least obviously, if not inherently the case, that some determination of which word the mouse is pointing to (i.e. "screen-scraping"/isolating the word to be translated) in order to obtain an appropriate translation. If there is no determination, then the system would be producing the correct translation based on a

haphazard guess, which makes no sense. Or the system would produce an incorrect translation which directly contradicts what Proszeky explicitly teaches. Therefore, since a determination of which words out of the many words in the text are to be processed is obviously necessary, this limitation is rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, applicant's argument specifically refers to "isolating a segment of text for performing the recognition of the text". This is not synonymous with "screen-scraping a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the mouse's pointer", and thus is not relevant unless it is claimed. All that is required is that there is some "screen-scraping" function which is taught/suggested by Proszeky because the mouse pointer "scrapes" the "screen" to identify/determine text that the mouse is pointing to (since Proszeky teaches some association between the mouse pointer and text, which are not two data entities that are generally linked). If applicant

Applicant then argues that Proszeky does not teach "4.2(b) calibrating the screen-scraped segment of text into a query according to one or more rules, the length of the segment of text being automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules" because "Proszeky suggests that the system 'looks up all words and expressions' of 'the appropriate word', but it does not [suggest/teach] treating a segment of text into a query which may be more than a word, such as a phrase, a sentence, or even a paragraph -- See paragraph [0050] of the present application" (Amendment, page 14).

This is not true, because Proszeky explicitly teaches looking up expressions and words (Section 4.7). The translation system receives some sort of input. This is at least

obviously the case because a translation cannot be performed if the translator is not given something to translate. As discussed above, Proszeky renders obvious the identification of something to translate (e.g. the word closest to the mouse pointer), and determining/identifying this word and producing a data entity to be input to the translation system can be interpreted as "calibrating a query", because a translation-input (i.e. a "translation query" because it is what the translator is asked/queried to translate) is generated/calibrated. Expressions include more than one word, and therefore are of a different text size (in the sense that a text's "size" is based on the number of words in the text) than singular words. Different expressions can have different numbers of words too (e.g. in Proszeky many different phrases are used in the description, such as "word-processor" and "dictionary module" in Section 4.7 and "MorphoLogic Bilingual Dictionaries" in Section 4.3, etc.).

Therefore, Proszeky teaches/suggests translating words and expressions of varying lengths. In order to accomplish this, it is at least obvious if not inherent to isolate whether it is a word that a user wants to translate or if it is an expression that the user wants to translate when the user points to something with his/her mouse. This suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that there is some determination of how many words in the text are to be input to the translator by the system ("automatically adjusting" since Proszeky describes a simple point-and-translate-interface and thus any determination of what there is to translate and whether an expression or word is to be translated is obviously done by the system because it is simpler than tediously forcing a user to input some other information to make the determination), because otherwise the

translation may not provide the user what he/she wants (i.e. a translation of the appropriate word or phrase).

Applicant's claim language "according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules" is rendered obvious by Proszeky under any number of interpretations. For example, the encoded algorithms in Proszeky's system can be "computer logic rules" that define how the system functions. As another example, an expression is what it is based on the language properties/constraints that make it an expression (e.g. "word-processor" is a two-word expression because there is a hyphen because that's one way/rule the English language uses to define a phrase). There is something in the system that lets the system know what constitutes an expression. Without such information the system would be haphazardly guessing that a given combination of any two words is an expression, which has a significant probability of producing a word combination that is not an expression, since consecutive words are not invariably phrases. This information can be interpreted as "linguistic rules" because they are based on the rules of the English language. They can also be interpreted as "grammatical rules" because English grammar contributes to defining why a phrase/expression is a phrase/expression and not just a nonsensical pair of words (e.g. "an adjective followed by a noun" is an English grammar "rule" that describes a descriptive phrase).

Although Proszeky does not explicitly use the words "logic rules" "grammar rules" and "linguistic rules", the teachings of Proszeky can be interpreted as rendering these limitations obvious based on characteristics of language, based on the nature of how

machines function, and based on the fact that, absent this information, it is incredibly unlikely the system described in Proszeky can function. Therefore, the teachings of Proszeky render these limitations obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As discussed above, what is rendered obvious is not limited to the four corners of the document, and obviousness is thus not limited to what is ANTICIPATED (i.e. explicitly described in a reference). As discussed above the references can also lead one of ordinary skill in the art to do what is necessary to implement what is explicitly taught, even if such "technical details", as applicant refers to them are not explicitly described in the Specification.

Applicant then argues that Proszeky does not teach "translating the query into a second language by looking up a database and applying a set of logic, linguistic and grammatical rules" because "Proszeky suggests...the translation of 'the appropriate word' but it does not [suggest/teach] translating the calibrated query, which may be more than a word, such as a phrase, a sentence, or even a paragraph" (Amendment, page 14).

Applicant's claim language, however, does not require that the query be more than a word, only that it be a "segment of text" which is calibrated into a query. "Segment" does not limit the claim language to multi-word queries, since a single word can be a segment/portion of a larger text. As discussed above, Proszeky suggests at least determining what to translate based on the fact that Proszeky teaches providing a translation of a word based on the mouse pointer. Since Proszeky teaches translating this determined input (i.e. the "query" to the translator), Proszeky's teaching of

translating even a single word reads on the claim language “translating said query into a second language” because applicant’s “query” is not limited to only multi-word queries.

Also, even if Proszeky does not explicitly teach the translation of multi-word queries, Proszeky does teach looking up expressions, which suggests translating the expressions because there is no other point to looking up the expressions, and the look-up is described in the context of a translation system. Since translations are typically performed by looking up the translation for a given word, this combination of teachings suggests translation of expressions because the expressions are looked up using the same dictionaries used to translate a word.

Applicant finally argues Proszeky does not teach “displaying on the user’s screen an annotation callout dynamically associated with the user’s mouse pointer, the annotation callout containing the query...” because “Proszeky suggests that the system displays the translation of the ‘appropriate’ word in another language, but it does not [suggest/teach] anything about the dynamic callout (Amendment, page 14).

This is not true, however, because “dynamic callout” is not what is claimed. What is claimed is a "callout dynamically associated..." and therefore what is dynamic is not the callout, but the association.

Applicant’s description of a “callout” is simply some sort of display containing the translation, which is obviously taught by Proszeky (“enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation”, Section 4). The user obviously if not inherently “sees” something that is displayed, which “calls out” to the user by drawing attention to

it (by the change in display, by the contents of the display including the information desired by the user, etc.).

This is “dynamically” associated with the mouse pointer because it is performed by the computer (i.e. “affected by the presence of power”) as opposed to being performed by the user or some other non-mechanical entity. “Dynamically” is not limited to whatever definition is intended by Applicant.

Therefore, the examiner maintains the previous prior art rejections of the independent claims because, even if Proszeky does not explicitly anticipate the limitations of the claims, the claims are still rendered obvious under Proszeky and the secondary references.

Applicant’s other arguments directed to Kutsumi, Mandt, and Scanlan, on page 15 of the Remarks are directed to the other references are based on "Proszeky...not disclos[ing] and... not anticipat[ing] the features of 4.2(a) and 4.2(b)" (Amendment, page 15). The rejections are maintained because applicant does not address the references directly, and as discussed above, Proszeky does render the limitations obvious and the rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 8, 15, 59, 60, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proszeky ("Experience from Translation of EU documents", EAMT Workshop, April 22-23, 1999. <http://www.mt-archive.info/EAMT-1999-TOC.htm>), in view of Kutsumi (US 5,826,219) and Mandt (US 6,621,532).

As per Claim 8, 15, 59, 60, Proszeky teaches/suggests in a computer environment in which a user interacts with a mouse, a mouse pointer and a screen, a system (and corresponding method) for carrying out a process for providing the user with an annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language contained in an electronic document displayed ("enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header)

said system/method consisting of

a module for screen-scraping a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's mouse pointer ("enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header; isolating the image for performing the recognition "scrapes" the word/text from the screen and is dependent on the mouse pointer's position)

a module for calibrating said screen-scraped segment of text into a query, the length of said segment of text being automatically adjusted according to one or more

logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules ("enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header; "multi-word expressions... phrasal compound", Section 4.2; "looks up all words and expressions", Section 4.7; performing the recognition to read the text "calibrates" the image into a computer-understandable text to be translated, and multi-word expressions are what they are based on the grammatical/linguistic structure of their respective languages)

a module for translating said query into a second language by looking up a database ("translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header)

a module for displaying on the user's screen a callout dynamically associated with the user's mouse pointer, said callout containing said query's translation and being adaptive to fit a content therein ("displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header; where the display of the translation at least obviously includes the entire translation, and as such the image presented which includes the display at least obviously is big enough to fit the translation)

Proszeky fails to teach a bilingual annotation, and where the callout contains said query as well.

Kutsumi teaches/suggests a bilingual annotation, and where the callout contains said query as well ("when displaying a translation result... given original phrase and its corresponding translated phrase can be displayed... other phrases... in ordinary display

mode", col. 21, lines 45-54; where Kutsumi teaches highlighting both the original and the translation, which at least suggests where the display in Proszeky is displayed with the original to set it apart from other phrases, as described in Kutsumi).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Proszeky to include the teaching of Kutsumi of a bilingual annotation, and where the callout contains said query as well, in order to distinguish translated text from ordinary text for easier recognition of what is translated, as described by Kutsumi (col. 21, lines 45-54).

Proszeky fails to teach further translating by applying a set of logic, linguistic, and grammatical rules.

Kutsumi teaches translating by applying a set of logic, linguistic, and grammatical rules ("grammar rule data... other translation rule data... used for the translation", col. 6, lines 27-41; where Kutsumi teaches translation via grammatical rules which reflect linguistic qualities of the language it applies to, and uses a form of logic to correctly apply the correct translation)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform a **simple substitution** of Proszeky's translation with the grammar-rule-based translation described in Kutsumi because Proszeky **contained a device which differed from the claimed device by the substitution** of whatever translation method Proszeky uses with grammar-rule-based translation taught in Kutsumi. Kutsumi teaches that grammar-rule-based translation **was known in the art**.

One of ordinary skill in the art could have substituted one translation method with another to obtain the **predictable results** of a machine that performs translation.

Proszeky, in view of Kutsumi, fail to teach where the callout has a tail which approximately overlaps the user's pointer.

Mandt suggests where the callout has a tail which approximately overlaps the user's pointer ("bubble help... passes the mouse pointer over... bubble help window appears... bubble help is located in close proximity", col. 8, lines 34-46; Figure 4; where Mandt teaches bubble help [callout] close to the pointer [approximately overlaps] and in Figure 4 displays a bubble with a tail, and so it is obvious that the bubble help that is near the pointer has a tail which points to the item the user pointed to because the tail would have a misleading effect otherwise).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform a **simple substitution** of Proszeky's translation display with Mandt's bubble help with tail because Proszeky **contained a device which differed from the claimed device by the substitution of** the display with a bubble help with tail display. Mandt teaches that the **substitute** bubble help with tail display **was known in the art**. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could have substituted one translation display for another to obtain the predictable results of a translation system that provides a displayed translation to a user.

3. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proszeky ("Experience from Translation of EU documents", EAMT Workshop, April 22-

23, 1999. <http://www.mt-archive.info/EAMT-1999-TOC.htm>), in view of Kutsumi (US 5,826,219) and Mandt (US 6,621,532) and Scanlan (US 6,857,022).

As per Claim 32, Proszeky teaches/suggests a method for returning to a user from a web server an annotation on a piece of textual information in a first language ("enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header)

Said method consisting of

moving the user's mouse pointer to a place in the user's screen, screen-scraping a segment of text adjacent to, or overlaid by, the user's mouse pointer ("enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header; isolating the image for performing the recognition "scrapes" the word/text from the screen and is dependent on the mouse pointer's position)

the length of said segment of text being automatically adjusted according to one or more logic, linguistic and/or grammatical rules ("enables a user to see the translation of displayed text... only has to move the mouse pointer over... character recognition... displays its translation", Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header; "multi-word expressions... phrasal compound", Section 4.2; "looks up all words and expressions", Section 4.7; performing the recognition to read the text "calibrates"

the image into a computer-understandable text to be translated, and multi-word expressions are what they are based on the grammatical/linguistic structure of their respective languages)

calibrating said screen-scraped segment of text into a query according to one or more rules, translating said query into a second language by looking up a database (“translation”, Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header)

displaying on the user’s screen a callout dynamically associated with the user’s mouse pointer, said callout containing said query’s translation and being adaptive to fit a content therein (“displays its translation”, Section 4, especially the 2nd paragraph above the Section 4.1 Header; where the display of the translation at least obviously includes the entire translation, and as such the image presented which includes the display at least obviously is big enough to fit the translation)

Proszeky fails to teach a bilingual annotation, and where the callout contains said query as well.

Kutsumi teaches/suggests a bilingual annotation, and where the callout contains said query as well (“when displaying a translation result... given original phrase and its corresponding translated phrase can be displayed... other phrases... in ordinary display mode”, col. 21, lines 45-54; where Kutsumi teaches highlighting both the original and the translation, which at least suggests where the display in Proszeky is displayed with the original to set it apart from other phrases, as described in Kutsumi).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Proszeky to include the teaching of Kutsumi of a bilingual

Art Unit: 2626

annotation, and where the callout contains said query as well, in order to distinguish translated text from ordinary text for easier recognition of what is translated, as described by Kutsumi (col. 21, lines 45-54).

Proszeky fails to teach further translating by applying a set of logic, linguistic, and grammatical rules.

Kutsumi teaches translating by applying a set of logic, linguistic, and grammatical rules ("grammar rule data... other translation rule data... used for the translation", col. 6, lines 27-41; where Kutsumi teaches translation via grammatical rules which reflect linguistic qualities of the language it applies to, and uses a form of logic to correctly apply the correct translation)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform a **simple substitution** of Proszeky's translation with the grammar-rule-based translation described in Kutsumi because Proszeky **contained a device which differed from the claimed device by the substitution** of whatever translation method Proszeky uses with grammar-rule-based translation taught in Kutsumi. Kutsumi teaches that grammar-rule-based translation **was known in the art**. One of ordinary skill in the art could have substituted one translation method with another to obtain the **predictable results** of a machine that performs translation.

Proszeky, in view of Kutsumi, fail to teach where the callout has a tail which approximately overlaps the user's pointer.

Mandt suggests where the callout has a tail which approximately overlaps the user's pointer ("bubble help... passes the mouse pointer over... bubble help window

appears... bubble help is located in close proximity", col. 8, lines 34-46; Figure 4; where Mandt teaches bubble help [callout] close to the pointer [approximately overlaps] and in Figure 4 displays a bubble with a tail, and so it is obvious that the bubble help that is near the pointer has a tail which points to the item the user pointed to because the tail would have a misleading effect otherwise).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform a **simple substitution** of Proszeky's translation display with Mandt's bubble help with tail because Proszeky **contained a device which differed from the claimed device by the substitution of** the display with a bubble help with tail display. Mandt teaches that the **substitute** bubble help with tail display **was known in the art**. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could have substituted one translation display for another to obtain the predictable results of a translation system that provides a displayed translation to a user.

Proszeky, in view of Kutsumi and Mandt, fail to teach in a computer network which supports a software application, said application having a graphical user interface embedded in each page of a web server's website, said graphical user interface having means for activation or deactivation of said application and means for selecting a second language from a list of languages for the user through a mouse, a mouse pointer and a screen in a local computer, and where the textual information is contained in the website supported by the web server, sending said screen-scraped segment of text to the web server.

Scanlan suggests in a computer network which supports a software application, said application having a graphical user interface embedded in each page of a web server's website, said graphical user interface having means for activation or deactivation of said application and means for selecting a second language from a list of language, for the user through a mouse, a mouse pointer and a screen in a local computer (Figure 6, "click", col. 5, lines 51-61; where Scanlan teaches the activation buttons, etc. and the translation being done in a server and the selection of languages; where the buttons at the very least suggest the use of a mouse because those are typically displayed and interfaced through a mouse pointer pressing a button), and where the textual information is contained in the website supported by the web server, sending said screen-scraped segment of text to the web server (Figure 1, "processes the request by translating the text... transferred to the customer's browser and displayed in the requested language", col. 3, lines 32-45; "web page", col. 3, lines 3-13; where Scanlan teaches that the translation is done remotely and so the remote location "serves" the customer with the translated information; Figure 1, "processes the request by translating the text... transferred to the customer's browser and displayed in the requested language", col. 3, lines 32-45; "web page", col. 3, lines 3-13; where Scanlan teaches that the translation is done remotely and shows in Figure 1 that documents [i.e., website/translation] is communicated between the customer/client and the translation server/manager. Scanlan also teaches translating graphics in col. 3, lines 32-46 and so suggests where the translation and OCR is done by the server as well)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to **perform a simple substitution** of whatever Proszeky's interface/at-least-local-translation is with Scanlan's interface/web-based-translation because the Proszeky's interface **differs from the claimed device** by the use of an interface with language selection and activation and web-based translation. Scanlan teaches that an interface including language selection and activation/deactivation **was known in the art**. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention **could have substituted** one interface for another and an at least local translation with another web based translation in order to obtain the **predictable results** of a web document translation system that has a graphical user interface.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC YEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4249. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EY 10/28/10
/Eric Yen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626